

**WIA Forums – Combined Notes:  
Waukesha (March 15-16, 2005) and Wausau (March 22-23, 2005)**

**DAY 1**

**Segment 1: Youth, Faith-Based and Community-Based Organizations,  
Demand-Driven Programs**

**YOUTH**

**Local initiatives that have been successful:**

- Physical areas at centers/sections of Job Center websites devoted to youth.
- Industry-specific youth training (construction, health care) that is tied to education (kids have to be attending school, achieving in school).
- Work with trainers certified in *Bridges Out of Poverty* program who understand poverty issues and relationship to attendance.
- Specialty youth One-stop.
- Partner with MATC on GED classes.
- Youth job fairs in spring for post-graduation work opportunities.
- Contracts with community agencies doing foster care with county; focus on WIA services to foster care community (similar contracts being explored in jail programs so that Job Centers can work with youth currently in jail).
- Programs on computer training, entrepreneurship, future goals/careers.
- Focus on internships for kids still in school.
- Rhinelander: schools have bought into idea that median standards and competencies are needed in job market and have created Employability Skills Certificate. Certificate provides basis for employer to see what student has accomplished; youth council disseminates this information to employers, Job Center sends out reps to schools.
- Milwaukee: focus on soft-skill training (character and spiritual development) that provides kids with purpose-driven lives. “Providing love and challenge.”
- Job Corps in Green Bay.
- South Central: career path goals program about to start.
- On-site GED training.

**Initiatives you would like to see?**

- Focus on work experience for disabled youth exiting high school.
- Need focus on initiatives that truly engage youth – can’t just do basic skills, education. Most don’t have positive experience with these. Instead, focus on
- hands-on opportunities
- Apprenticeships at business – business-sponsored trainings. In general, need to engage businesses with youth.
- Push four-year college programs.

- Make better use of 2+2+2 system – provide better opportunities for poor youth to access system.
- **More youth involvement in Job Centers.** (Note: Points made in **BOLD** indicate that many people made the same point.)
- More partnering (of programs and funds) – use Perkins funds, school-to-work program funds, others. Be creative.
- State needs to make sure resources are equally distributed to people of color in Wisconsin.
- Statewide curriculum/credential that is industry-driven, that means something more than a piece of paper – could involve different tracks for different industries.
- We are good at youth programs, but not at changing structures. Business people feel that most kids don't have the skills businesses think are absolutely necessary. Tech colleges and universities spend lots of money on K-12 graduates who can't perform at level business needs. Need systemic change.
- Need a feedback system from business, so we don't change system once and leave it. Need to know what business needs on ongoing basis.

### **Resources needed from State?**

- Easier access to Youth Options system, especially for at-risk youth – really hard to get into the system now.
  - o Concern that this may be too expensive to access – state aids don't always cover costs, so school districts won't market YO and other programs. Cheaper to educate kids on own campus. (Example: Appleton SD is not marketing YO at all; many think they don't offer program.)
  - o Tech schools should maybe share part of this cost.
- Technology needs to be made available throughout system for youth (especially rural areas).
- Need leadership from state – who is leader in workforce system? Need central place for information/dissemination: should be WDBs with collaboration from tech colleges and secondary schools. Players have to be brought to table by the state to collaborate.
- Especially need more short-term training – employers are driven to this. Problem is that tech colleges more likely to fund two-year programs. There is a disconnect.
- Transportation and child care for youth with kids, in both urban and rural areas.
- Ensure that performance measures and service requirements actually go hand-in-hand – currently, seems that programs are set up to fail.
- Need technical assistance (TA) from state.
- State should facilitate Job Center relationships with industry.
- More data on portfolios.
- Data already gathered on apprenticeship programs – local boards should get access to this and other Department of Public Instruction (DPI) data.
- Need to work better with schools to figure out who's responsible for what – when kid drops out, school still gets money for that kid, when actually the WD system needs it to train the kid. Someone needs to take responsibility. State needs to

make information available, coordinate among state department and school system players.

### **How to reach out-of-school youth?**

- Technology – maybe mobile computer lab?
- Other central location (besides schools) to serve youth, especially in rural areas.
- More options at tech college level for out-of-school disabled youth to complete high school education (GED options).
- Need to focus on youth in jail – group really needs services but present huge problems on the WIA performance measure side.
  - o Need to be very careful on how you align incarcerated youth with employment options – need to take hard look at what is possible and not possible given barriers facing these youth (e.g. can't place them where they need drivers' licenses).
  - o Potentially use Department of Corrections bonds.
- **Need incentives/motivation for out-of-school youth.**
- 21-year-olds don't think of themselves as "youth" – need to change language.
- Pre-work to let them practice in working world (up close and personal attention to working habits).
- Engage them earlier, possibly while still in school
- Work off of youth mentality and peer pressure – what influences youth most is other youth, not teachers or parents. Need to develop positive gain environment.
- More partnering with WD system, work more with schools and employers, get employers into schools earlier.

### **FAITH- AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS (FCBO)**

#### **Local initiatives that have been successful:**

- Racine: Racine Vocational Ministries – provides high-impact services, very intensive, strong faith-based component. Information sharing with One-Stop, some cross-training.
- Milwaukee: funding through DOL to do surveying, get handle on what it is that CBOs/FBOs are doing now.
- Doesn't seem like there's lots going on now beyond cross-referrals.
- UMOS: churches do services at camps.
- Churches often provide help with crisis issues: homelessness, clothing/food needs.
- Influx of Hmong has meant involvement of immigrant FBOs; making networks within that immigrant community has been successful.
- Success in working with United Way, St. Vincent de Paul, Salvation Army, Goodwill Industries.
- Problem: most relationships are voluntary, most experience is with making referrals, not getting them back.
- Clothing closets at local churches.

- LaCrosse has YWCA program to house women who have been incarcerated – also 24-hour mentorship and job training. Up to 12 women per year. Has been very successful program.

### **To what extent are you already involved in these collaborations?**

- Western part of state: inter-denominational group has formed “peace committee,” has contracted with Job Center to do anger management training.
- Not much right now.
- Networking, relationship with literacy councils (WIA and W-2).
- Easier to make contacts with CBOs than FBOs – less comfortable with latter.
- Some vouchers, etc. to Goodwill that are program-funded (but still a one-way referral)
- Budget cuts make it hard to get out into community and do outreach
- Info sessions for CBOs plus Job Center partners – all share handouts of what each can provide, so everyone learns about referral networks.
- Marathon County does monthly meeting of all in Job Center network – informal meeting housed at Wausau Job Center of anyone who can make it – share what’s new, what services are available, etc. Results in many referrals to the Job Center, especially from Salvation Army and Goodwill. Started by one staffer sending out invites. Easier in small towns because people know each other.
- LaCrosse: uses funds from Department of Health to fund community liaison who goes out into community and lets them know all services.

### **Initiatives you would like to see?**

- Funding for coordinator at local level to act as liaison between Job Centers and FCBOs.
- **Concerns related to this issue: accountability issues, WIA performance standards, etc. aren’t necessarily shared across groups.**
  - o People see lack of capacity at FCBOs to meet extensive state performance standards and accounting measures. Possible need for intermediary support from larger FBOs that are attached to the smaller groups.
- Want to make sure they are closely attached to **OS system**.
- Work with prisoners/correctional department. Need for people with passionate interest in population to work with WD system.
- Need to do more outreach because FCBOs don’t know what Job Centers are, what they do.
- Need to encourage two-way street – get as well as give referrals.
- Disability Navigator funding has been very helpful – worry about long-term funding of those activities. In several areas, this has helped connect WD to FCBOs. Similar story with veteran representatives.
- Tech colleges could play a role in creating relationships.
- FCBOs have large network of volunteers – this can help make up for big reduction in WD funding.

- Beef up ex-offender program – men and women and youth have different problems.
- Use court system – hardly ever hear of anyone going to courts themselves to ask for help for services for youth, ex-offenders. Communities should tap into this resource.

### **Resources needed from state?**

- **Need some TA and guidelines to keep out of difficulties, especially in legal relationships with FBOs**
- Funding to help with TA for FCBOs (e.g. grant-writing training, accounting help) – this would ensure consistency of training from those organizations.
- Resources for local coordination.
- Dissemination of lessons learned from state refugee office project, which represented a big FBO collaboration with the state.
- Many FBOs are distrustful of taking federal funding. Might be good to have a state handout giving guidance on these issues, providing successful case studies etc.
- Continue Navigator program.
- **Clarification on what state's relationship is now with these organizations.**
- Literacy councils need to be funded, especially those that relate to ESL.
- Re-fund *Children First*, other programs for at-risk youth.
- FUNDING
- FCBOs need training in how to deal with federal and state money. Also there is an accountability issue – what do you do when they fail?
- Youth should be target group of WIA to serve – better than having as separate program (e.g. *Children First*) because silos make people fall through cracks.
- Lots of concern about liability issues, fuzziness about relationships, and appropriate monitoring. Mention of Equal Opportunity laws, FBOs being exempt from accountability in ways that Job Centers cannot be.

### **DEMAND-DRIVEN**

#### **Local initiatives that have been successful:**

- Fox Valley and Bay Area did ED study (NorthStar) of 17 counties – 10-15 year study. Identified high-growth areas, cluster development, etc.
- Milwaukee: *Initiative for Competitive Milwaukee* (Bader Foundation) – also a cluster study. Now focusing job training on high-demand clusters in WD system.
- Tech colleges have taken initiative in health care, identified high-demand jobs there.
- Short-term training to respond to local employer needs (14-week CNC operator training rather than a two-year program at tech college).
- Regional planning in WOW/Milwaukee, focusing on how to grow local economy at regional level.

- Use of JobFit – analyze skills in labor pool, allows Job Centers to do better match between worker/employer.
- Customized job training for high-demand skills – surgical tech (training by hospitals), CNA (collaboration with tech colleges), satellite installation at homes (six-week training, \$10/hour job) – gives people basic skills so they can be hired, then employers can give softer skill training on the job.
- Some Job Centers respond to employers as well as job seekers – see them as clients.
- One program markets to new students interested in health career – one-year health program rather than two-year RN program (Medical assistance, LBN).
- Basic skill assessment for larger businesses, screen applicants for other employers (mini job fairs that spotlight some businesses).
- Sector based work – developing analysis by sector, including skills needed for that sector (including analysis of county (demographic, job needs, etc)).
- Partnerships with regional planners.

### **Initiatives you would like to see?**

- Better use of surveys done by Manpower.
- **Better use of DWD labor market data.**
- More opportunities for training, especially incumbent worker training.
- Focus on necessary support services (transportation, childcare).
- Consistent marketing efforts on what Job Centers have to offer.
- *Bridges Out of Poverty* expanded to employers, job seekers, other partners.
- Statewide ability to access info on labor pools using LMI data.
- Collaboration with school system to respond to training needs while exploring private vendor opportunities.
- Upgrade [JobNet](#) and enhance it.
- **Policy/direction to local boards on how to allocate training resources – right now a hodgepodge of customer choice, etc. Would rather see overall plan, industry areas (e.g. housing production) where state is trying to have a focus, where region needs to focus, etc. Boards should feel that they're part of a bigger policy/plan.**
  - o Maybe policy should be articulated by boards and not state – some hostility toward state being in this position. Need to balance local needs and state needs.
- **Focus resources we have on high-road jobs – automate other stuff, but instead of having many Job Centers trying to do everything for everyone, focus on what needs to happen to get *good* jobs.**
- Feedback system with business so we know what they need, how we're doing. Needs to be immediate feedback. Need a system.
- Get employers to buy into system by helping them recognize burgeoning skill/worker shortages.
- Bring all workers up to skill level required of entry level workers. No longer true that “if you have a pulse you can get a job.”
- Business needs to support Job Centers because of lack of resources from the state.

- Problem: time lag. Takes 2-3 years to train health care worker – will demand still be there?
  - o Still a need for basic skills/remediation and soft skills – but hard to know what job seekers are demanding because they just want a job. Employers definitely want the soft skills.
  - o Need to focus on support mechanisms (child care, transportation) – focusing just on the end product of the job isn't enough. Need to look at entire job-seeking process.
- Would like to do employer surveys and possibly charge for this service.

### **Resources needed from state?**

- **Fill local LMI positions!**
- More money.
- Staff training, especially on effective use of LMIs, state job data.
- Need state to get out of the way, let local people handle local issues. Need support in regional planning – don't give statewide standard that might not apply to each region. State shouldn't tell employers what they need.
- System coordination between WIA and Individual Training Account (ITA) programs at the local level.
- Less duplication of offerings, even online. Would be nice to have business resources all in one place, consolidated. Right now there are too many sites with same information for businesses. Need clearinghouse of information for businesses.
- Electronic support – better feedback.
- Engage employers in statewide system.
- Bring K-12 education more in line with business needs.
- More recognition and empowerment of system, down into local areas.
- Better information – stronger local labor market info, consistent skills assessment, skills matching.
- Wisconsin needs to come up with definition of demand-driven, and set a standard for what that means here. Include high-growth, high-wage jobs; include industries. Should become common knowledge throughout the state what “good job” means – could reward high-road employers in whatever way state wants.

### **Segment 2: WDA Plans**

#### **Make sense? What's missing?**

- On page 2 of discussion draft, 5 & 7 local alignment section: see this as something to strive for, but notion of complete alignment very hard to imagine in current environment. May need more info on what “alignment” means.
- Section 1-c: Labor market isn't solid. We need a way to conduct analysis for each area, get information when areas need it.
- On page 1 of handout, section on standards of coordination: will standards be coming out?

- On Number 5, accountability of system: how is that going to be measured?  
Nothing that requires partners to come to table and participate.
- Section 1-d, demand-driven business services: concern that funding that Job Centers currently have isn't designated for businesses, but is mostly designated for job seekers. Raises red flags, because Job Centers can't figure out how to do a demand-driven program without funding.
- On no. 8, performance benchmarks: there is confusion. What performance benchmarks are we talking about here? WIA standards? Plan standards? Has DWD opened a discussion on these performance standards?
  - o DWD: no, haven't started this yet – CWI also looking at benchmarks, report cards, regional reports, etc. Lots of discussion on this, not clear yet what standards will be.
- Hard to know what plans to put forward right now with all upcoming changes.
- Any goals developed for these plans should be developed in context of Job Centers – system goals should be based on Job Center goals.
- People are willing to plan together, but when budgets get reduced, plan tends to go out window.
- Coordination is expensive, takes time, resources.
- Plan needs to be means to an end, not the end itself.
- Want to know what level of detail state will want in these plans.
- Hard to do system-wide plan when partners have different goals, levels of cooperation.
- Not enough time/resources to do good job.
- Hope that plan approval process is more of a clarification/conversation with the state, rather than the state requiring endless modifications to fit one standard model.
- **How is this different from plan 5 years ago?**
  - o DWD: lots of changes have happened since last plan, including development of *Grow Wisconsin*, changes in manufacturing and outsourcing, new WIA coming out, recession, new emphasis on business community
- We spend too much time planning, not doing. DWD should focus on lowering regulatory burden and on infrastructure, that's it.
- Some areas have done regional planning, others have not. Those that haven't may not have the resources.
- **What is the impetus for other partners to participate?**
- Business participation not emphasized in guidelines, but state keeps bringing it up – are they mandatory partners? Are competing ED agencies mandatory partners?
- More marketing needs to be done to business if we really want them in on planning process.
- System has never been empowered as planning agency for all these other programs/plans. If not empowered as broker, how do we get it to happen?
- Is big plan really a conduit between local plan and state plan? Needs to be clear in guidelines.



- **LOTS of confusion about who's doing this plan, where it fits in with local and state plans. Why isn't there just ONE plan, showing how WIA funding is integrated at local, regional, state level?**
- Challenges to implementing plan:
  - o Conflict between encouragement of entrepreneurship and performance standards.
  - o Need resources to implement plan, track performance standards.
  - o Is plan realistic given what's actually happening on the ground?
  - o Areas are not self-contained: areas need to work closely together on plans especially where boundaries go over commute sheds, etc.
  - o Training providers aren't keeping up with demand (takes forever to keep up with RN programs etc) – especially tech colleges.
- Want flexibility depending on area.
- Missing: more short-term training (tech colleges, UW need to respond to employer needs).
- Require all employment programs to financially support Job Centers – federal and state.
- Training for case managers.
- Streamline programs – do we want many FBOs and CBOs duplicating services?
- Agree with having business plans and MOUs, and focus is helpful as long as it's clear.
- Don't like one-size-fits-all – want to retain flexibility, have broader guidelines
- Rural/urban issues may not be the same
- Demand-driven concept is moving target – are we only targeting major industries? What about emerging industries? What if these change?
- **Still funding silos that are barriers – plan will be hard unless state requires involvement by all state agencies with stake in plan (UW, W-2, DVR, K-12, tech colleges). Even if mandatory partners, may not participate.**
- WIBs not necessarily consistent throughout state in their involvement in Job Centers – are they oversight or hands-on? Needs to be clear across the state.
- Fox Valley now has regional economic study covering 18 counties; has taught them a lot about process. Big plan framework makes sense to them. However, the challenge is communicating with all constituencies. FV has found they have groups breaking off according to ED, business, etc. by region. Getting to that level of organization is hard.
- Has to be emphasis on developing regional approach. Want to get to point where if there's an inquiry about a business locating in Fond du Lac, ED people in area could articulate why it might be better somewhere else.
- Milwaukee is a real challenge in big plan challenge. How do you begin to get a plan for Milwaukee with all the political problems there?
- **As we focus on big plan, how to account for those on lowest rungs on economic scale? How do we get them engaged in system when we're so focused on business?**
- Framework looks good. Time frames are worrying. Lots to accomplish in not too much time.
- May not be adequate staffing to do this.

- Each partner has different funding source. How to keep from tripping over each other?
- How to get partners to the table? Probably should be mandated by state in some fashion. May be particularly difficult given short-term timeline, especially in ED area.

### Resources needed from State?

- Need benchmarking across the state.
- **Need state support to get other programs to the table – they can use resources over which they have control to get those program to the table, participating. State needs to use leverage, not just depend on WDBs to get others to the table.**
- State-driven alignment needs to occur first, before locals can get alignment.
- **Planning funds! Planning funds!**
- **Resources of folks like LMI – need both provision and interpretation of data from LMI.**
- Consistency/guidance/language related to how MOU is formatted – need locals to basically have similar standards/formatting for these plans.
- Coordination with DPI, need for student graduation information (secondary schools) as part of plan.
- Surveys on skills gaps.
- New [WorkNet](#) system will make data collection easier.
- Need to know what state really wants to measure here. Not enough resources to do follow-up on absolutely everyone who comes through the center; if that's what's wanted.
- Need data on emerging occupations, skills needed in those occupations. This message needs to get to the schools as well.
- Help with moving focus to businesses, when 50K job seekers are coming through the door.
- **Get other state departments to cooperate (e.g. Commerce).**
- Do planning at state level, similar to what locals are being asked to do.
- Written guidance to clarify plan process.
- Shorter plan process (using check boxes etc).
- Better understanding of how to use Census information.
- Potentially provide access to Strategic Advantage software ([www.economicmodeling.com](http://www.economicmodeling.com)) – might help support local processes.
- Clear info on services available for businesses.
- Continuing education from state for case managers on career planning, teaching life skills.
- Clarity on ED organizations, why there are so many, who runs/pays for them.
- **In-person LMI time for region – note that needs vary across regions**
- Nice to pick one system – too many computer job systems, would be nice if these were consistent.
- Hire facilitators for groups like this.
- Access to UI databases to track people – why so hard? State should help.

- Connect business programs with WIA programs.
- Better connect WIA and TAA.
- Funding info on all available resources coming into areas – this will allow Job Centers to be more creative about programs and services.
- Difficulty with workforce profiles – need to be developed on regional basis.  
(Note: may already be in development – there is some confusion).
- WorkNet is a source of information, but some people are finding it difficult to use it effectively. Need some way to understand process, like a seminar.
- Has to be a state vision and a plan that mandates that all partners put resources on the table so there is real integrated service delivery system.
- Strategies/resources for recognizing we're in a different economy, and getting those on lowest rungs into high road economy.

### **Who needs to be at the table? How can we get them there?**

- ED agencies
- Chamber of Commerce
- Private sector
- Department of Commerce
- Correctional system
- CBOs and FBOs
- Job seekers
- Representatives of customers with stake in the process – e.g. public schools
- State and local legislators
- Trade organizations
- Front-line Job Center staff (case managers, etc)
- Governor
- Elder groups
- Educators, especially K-12, tech colleges, four-year colleges/universities
- Industry from the targeted areas, especially high-road industry
- Probation and parole
- Tribal representation
- Advocacy groups for significant segments of population
- WDB members (in West Central part of the state, members form councils, report back to boards. Works in private sector and ED areas.)
- Ways to get any of these to table:
  - o Let county officials know they're fiscally liable
  - o Unless there is a clear requirement/impetus, then who should be at table should be flexible at local level. Otherwise locals may just spend time trying to get them there, not planning.
  - o Requiring other partners to show in their own plans that they coordinated with boards
  - o Need teeth.
  - o When involving employers, keep it SIMPLE (“What do you need?”)
  - o Can we make WDB part of planning for tech college system, in same way tech colleges are being mandated in WDB system?

- Cannot appeal to philanthropic urges – must be value added for partners.
- Would be very helpful if Governor and CWI publicly urged these partnerships. CWI has members who command respect from necessary partners – needs to endorse this from very top, give same message throughout system. Key position statements needed from those folks, encouraging partners to come to table. Would get system reform much further along.
- Have to actually mandate partners that are supposedly mandated. State really needs to put muscle behind mandates. “We aren’t really ready for the party yet, because all the mandated partners are not singing the same song.”
- Board members need to be convenors, need to be in role of facilitating discussion

### **Segment 3: Job Center Requirements**

#### **Make Sense?**

- Number 3 on comprehensive center requirements: what will back this up in order for this requirement to work? How to make partners be partners if they don’t want?
- No. 8 on comprehensive center requirements: confused about what IT systems we’re talking about – when looking at range of mandatory partners, what does DWD IT system mean? Many systems are not obsolete, and different programs use different systems. Not clear what system is meant here.
- **No. 6 on comprehensive center requirements, 5 on satellite center requirements, no. 4 on waived center requirements re. ADA: everyone wants to be accessible, but there have been no results from the accessibility reviews done a few years ago, so no one knows whether they meet requirements. Also: incredibly hard to get partners to pay for these improvements**
- No 3 on comprehensive center requirements: some reaction to common cost requirements – feeling is that all mandatory partners should share.
- Component F: W-2 has found it fiscally responsible to move back into county offices in some cases so they don’t have to pay double. But if there were a requirement for sharing costs, they would have to do this whether they were in a Job Center or not.
- No 2 on comprehensive center requirements: overly defined. Should allow for more flexibility – should allow for people with other primary duties to also staff resource room.
- Question about no. 1 on waived center requirements: how to demonstrate that needs are not being met by existing Job Centers?
- Lots of undefined terms – “sharing of common costs”? “Accessibility”? “Use of the IT system”? “Business plan”? “JobNet Business”? Need definitions in order to intelligently discuss.

- Makes sense IF some of these things defined: “shared cost” – does this mean rent and staff? Do you need to have both shared, or just one? “Staff physically housed” – for how long? 40 hours/week? One day?
- Category “waived” needs to be defined more – what is purpose?
- What competencies are required for Job Center staff? Would there be state training?
- What does “access” mean when talking about partners? Technological? Physical?
- Do customers really care about classification system?
- What is advantage of classifying in this manner?
- Why not use local determination of what is best for WDA (instead of state standards)?
- On requirement regarding state staff not on site vs. state staff on site for JobNet – if no state staff, is it a comprehensive center?
- Raises issues for rural counties when it comes to staffing/cross-sharing.
- Satellite center attached to comprehensive – does that mean satellite center needs to give \$\$ to comprehensive?
- Job centers need to be identified as Job Centers, not W-2 offices – this is a challenge in Milwaukee.
- Concern about collocation of Wagner-Peyser staff.
- May not be possible to parcel this out in neat set of criteria; many decisions will be made more wisely at local level.
- Missing under comprehensive, maybe satellite: something that gets at addressing staffing ratio issues at Job Centers. What minimal level of staffing do these programs need?
- Missing: systematic training of staff.
- Need clarification on what constitutes an “agency” – what if one staffer is funded through a bunch of different funding streams? In rural areas, one person may be funded by six programs.
- Relationship to common performance measures is unclear.
- Concern about role of the state: state as oversight or state as partner?
- How do dollars flow between comprehensive and satellite centers? Controlled by comprehensive and allotted to satellite? Need definition.
- How does comprehensive deal with effect of shrinking revenue?
- Where does authority lie? Who can genuinely make decisions? Definition of comprehensive center should greater clarity on administration of center.
- Can we define centers in terms of outcomes instead of getting back to process definitions?
- If comprehensive center definition remains the same, there would be competition in areas to become the comprehensive center; would not improve anyone’s performance.

Connie Colussy, DWD: reaction to request for training staff – Financial and Employment Planners (FEPs) have to complete courses (prescribed training plan) before working directly with customers – suggested that WIA have some kind of foundation training. Made proposal to CWI to tap some of their money to give to Boards to work on credentialing process for line staff. Investigated many certifications; liked NAWDP course. Certificate is competency-based. Connie has also talked to NAWDP people about current training given by DWD, whether these courses could meet certain competencies. They are in a conversation about this. Note that part of certificate is that person must belong to professional organization.

### **Are there criteria that should be added/removed?**

- Need a clearer understanding of how money is attached to these requirements.
- Note: too short a time to give thorough discussion to this issue, which is very important to Job Centers.
- Is there a limit on number of satellites attached to one comprehensive?
- Need a clearer understanding of when you actually need to collocate, when you can just have a plan to collocate; include details on length of time for plan.
- What is real threat if this system is not followed by existing Job Centers? Does this mean all state staff/resources are pulled out the building? If so, is this realistic? Maybe emphasis should be on \$ incentives if you meet this system, not punishment if you do not.
- Tech colleges receive a lot of our dollars but don't seem to contribute to infrastructure. Needs to be rethought.
- Wondering when an OSO is different from one-stop management team. Needs clarification.
- Questions: what percent of time would employee of state organization need to be involved at Job Center to make it count as an organization being represented in the Job Center?
- Waived centers should also operate under a business plan.
- Regions work together differently, have different partners. Some boards work very well with tech colleges, others not as well.
- Definitions would be very important – need to know what some of these things mean, and if we did, we might want to see some deleted.
- Questions regarding monitoring of comprehensive center: Who does it? Does this person monitor satellite as well?
  - o DWD answer: Probably the WDB
- Concern that a more urban comprehensive center business plan won't work for a more rural satellite center. Important that process of bus plan ensures that satellites have involvement, everyone has good understanding both urban and rural.
- Question about required partners – why is Wagner-Peyser required? If there is a vacancy due to retirement and it's not filled, what does that mean for the Job Center?
- In this climate, with very minimal resources, how can we impose all these requirements onto the centers? Many current centers are pretty comprehensive

but don't have Wagner-Peyser people. Removing these centers would be disastrous. Should be a local decision.

- Note from Gary: satellite centers still get resources. Just need to be connected to a comprehensive center.

- If WIA Title 1 funds someone, and that person performs Wagner-Peyser duties, does that person qualify as a W-P staffer?
- Ideas: possibility of having only one comprehensive center per WDA, as the foundation for planning; possibility of having a single planning entity within the area. Basic point is that system has been very decentralized; this has been good and bad. Needed now is real authority that is centralized and defined, that can allocate resources to all partners, so we can have Job Center system in local area.
- Neither satellite nor waived should have to be tied to a business plan – satellites are such different areas from comprehensives.
- Performance training should be held after Job Centers know what services they are required to provide

### **Are there partners that should be added/removed?**

- Child care, medical assistance, tech college other higher education
- Older worker program, migrant opportunity services
- Services for in-school youth should not be in center
- Wagner-Peyser maybe shouldn't be required partner (because not enough staff)
- Note that what might be very important partner in one place isn't as important in another
- Linkages with ED should be required, but ED organizations should not be necessary partners.
- Absolutely need tech colleges
  - Note: some discussion about lack of accountability of the Tech colleges, lack of coordination among them, wildly divergent involvement with the WD system
  - Perkins dollars could be leveraged to mandate tech college involvement in the Job Centers
- Would be great to be able to use UI trust funds strategically, to ensure that people don't become unemployed.
- Dept of Commerce reps should be included in centers if they're going out to meet with businesses.
- Substantial providers of employment training services in particular areas should be added.
- Would be great to have Social Security on site.
- Questions about whether there will be flexibility for satellites to associate with comprehensive centers in regions that are not within their WDA?
  - DWD: not at this time

### **Are the numbers of required partners right?**

- Seems reasonable
- Not sure can be standardized across 11 WDAs.
- 4 seems right for comprehensive centers, but there is concern over definition of “house” (how many hours/week?) – also, what support will there be for non-cooperating partners?
- Vet program should be added
- Unemployment should be added
- No partners should be removed.
- If there is access to programs, why require 2 partners at satellite center? If one there (in resource room) at all times, that might be adequate & better use of resources.
- JobNet crucial to resource rooms
- Would be nice to have all mandatory partners in comprehensives, but 3-4 reasonable.
- Many satellites would love to have more partners but can’t because lack of space, therefore they split up the week. Need to recognize reality of this.
- Should be decision of local board how many partners they have.
- Partners are at different tiers – some much more important than others.

### **Other discussion:**

- Would help to revisit these standards after many of the terms are defined: business plan, service standards, etc.
- Q whether DWD hopes to have criteria incorporated into five-year plan?
  - o DWD: yes, designations are in the law now; general idea is to put these into the WIA plan.
- Need more clarity regarding oversight: would this come from DWD or some other state agency? For example, if business plan lays out strategy and center isn’t meeting standards, who oversees this?
  - o DWD: WDB is first line of oversight.
- ADA reports – when will these come back?
  - o DWD: reports are in DWD offices now, and DWD is in the process of sending them out. There will also be a small amount of money available to each WDA to implement changes suggested in the surveys.



## DAY 2

(Note: Participants in Wausau actually covered Job Center Business Plans on Day 1)

### Segment 1: Job Center Service Standards

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS:

##### Make sense?

- Conflict between targeting “high-demand occupations” and “customer choice.” Also, must note that customer choice depends on availability of funds.
- Need information on training providers and their success rates; poor performers should be removed from lists.
- Who determines staff competencies? No consistent WIA training or staff certification process.
- Performance standards are all over the place and overwhelming; need to focus in on key areas (like W-2 does)
- Nothing about “demand-driven” included in standard.
- No – Job Centers is again talking about place, not system.
- Based on notion that we have Job Center partners that all work on same standards, have same outcomes. Not true. Want to move to outcome-based system.
- Makes sense as collaboration among agencies
- **Question about confidentiality – aren’t there legal issues with this, such as getting school data? Student has to request this information; Job Centers cannot. Needs more clarification.**
- No way that a waived Job Center could meet these standards. WDA could meet outcomes, but not individual centers.
- Local centers have processes in place to take customer through system – service standards seem to preempt these by indicating that customer has a choice.

##### Resources needed from the State?

- **Statewide training plan for staff**
- Reporting of training vendor performance
- On-line, user-friendly organized policy.
- Feedback system.
- More guidance on confidentiality issues among partners.
- **More consistent standards for all partners – some teeth to get partners to fall in line.**

## **JOB SEEKER SERVICE STANDARD:**

### **Do the standards make sense?**

- Need more LMI in format that is easy to access and share.
- Need a system for capturing general info on clients (eg: IL Skills Match, JobFit); employers want skills matching.
- Need clear definition of “qualified” staff.
- These are minimum standards – Job Center services will go well beyond.
- Definition of “customer” unclear.
- Which partner will provide this, and how do you sort out different assessment processes used by different centers?
- **Competencies of staff – different companies will have different competencies. But could have a set that everyone agrees to – possibly a credentialing system.**
- Silent on difference between comprehensive and satellite centers, so it’s not helpful to give guidance for how different centers will meet the standards. What does “in accordance with” mean?

### **Does the guidance make sense?**

- Phone requirement – will that be paid for by UI? How can that be supported?
- Computer terminal designated for UI to apply on line might be useful.

### **Resources needed from the State?**

- To start to think of this as Job Center system, we need \$ for technology infrastructure for follow up.
- Need universal sense of what test should be used in Job Center, by all partners.
- Would like 1-800 system to be funded for each WDA – core service people need to know how to access existing TA.
- On-line tutorials for applying for jobs, including resume development and other skills.
- Every customer should have resume and three appropriate job leads. These are outcomes that all partners in Job Centers should keep in mind. How the Job Center gets at this is a local decision. Then, once the person is eligible for programming, other processes would kick off.
- Again, need feedback system that includes system-wide data (e.g. UI system data).
- Access to online alternative training available in tech college, other systems. Many workers want to do this training but don’t know where/how. Jobcenter.org doesn’t give enough information, or information is not accessible enough.

- Doesn't seem that Job Centers should be negotiating MOUs in 11 different areas. Ought to be mandatory requirement from state that sets minimum standards of information sharing between tech colleges and Job Centers. Individual Job Centers shouldn't have to work out these agreements on their own. Problem with tech colleges is that they're not located in Job Centers but are mandatory partner. Seems like DWD, WTCS, Commerce, others should set up the required level of contribution.
  - o Connie: mentions virtual site that gives info on all tech college courses available. But several people commented that this should be linked somehow to the Job Centers.
- Could virtual training site that's now only available for staff be made available for customers as well? That is a very helpful site.

## **EMPLOYER/BUSINESS SERVICE STANDARD:**

### **Do the standards make sense?**

- Job orders – who provides assistance, Wagner-Peyser?
- Program performance – where is the data? Only WIA data public and shared?
- LMI – in addition to DWD wage surveys, what other data can be used?
- “Employers special recruiting requests should be honored” – what does this mean?
- What are “out-placement services”?
- Nothing about “demand-driven” included in standard.
- What kinds of outreach to the business community are expected?
- How can we focus on employer needs when have so many job seekers to serve? And when staff performance is tied to job placement?
- Nothing particular about veterans in any of the standards; they have a special statutory place.
- Standards do make sense overall.
- Have to look at how to evaluate effectiveness of standards. Should be evaluated at local level, by the board. Local evaluations should go on to the state.
- **Concern that Job Centers won't have resources to provide all services required.**
- New system suggests that anyone would be allowed to enter job orders. Thought is that there should be criteria so that job orders are consistently entered. Job orders need to be defined as well.
- **How would standards apply to comprehensive, satellite, waived Job Centers?**
- Concern that it would be hard to track outcomes for non-program eligible participants.
- Establishing local assessments to determine what standards available at different centers is important.
- Standard E: needs to be strong relationship with DOL, especially concerning expansions.

### **Does the guidance make sense?**

- Refers to state-wide programs introduced to Job Centers – what are these? Would state provide materials?
- Seems like a lot of micromanagement of local Job Centers through these standards.
- Concern that waived Job Centers won't be able to provide job fairs, etc
- Individual Job Centers need to determine what needs to be done regarding employer special recruiting – this is a local decision.
- **Assumes there is data sharing among agencies, but sometimes this doesn't actually happen.**
- Why do employers need access to placement related performance results?

### **Resources needed from the State?**

- Data on performance for each partner program.
- Additional resources if employers request more than core services.
- Need time frame for change.
- Need to have strategic plan in place for each Job Center.
- Resources for infrastructure.
- **Information, staffing, resources.**

### **INF SHARING/NON-DUPLICATION SERVICES STANDARD:**

#### **Do the standards make sense?**

- **Too idealistic - not all agencies can/will share information, especially given concerns about confidentiality.**
- Each program has its own rules, regulations, client reporting systems, so “single service plan” standard is unrealistic.
- One case manager can't do it all.
- Assessment section especially troublesome, multiple assessment tools may be too much or too little.
- Yes, except for expectation that there is only one reporting system, when in fact all partners have different systems.
- All partners need to be involved, not just one or two.
- Need to knock down barriers between programs.
- Particular attention needs to be given to data-sharing agreements.

### **Does the guidance make sense?**

- Hard to comply if everyone on different system.
- What is process of written release of confidential information? Could this be a partial release, or release to only some agencies?
- Unclear what “JobNet Business” means.

- Some partners can't share customer info, so we need more realistic guidelines on info sharing.
- Should continue to look at lean management principles.
- Employer record system should be mandatory.
  - o **DWD: this is going to morph into JobNet Business.**
- Economic support services: what does this mean? Why is it standing alone?
- Ideas about marketing plans should be better defined; needs to be one plan per center.

### **Resources needed from the state?**

- Resources to support a single management information system, and staff to collect and analyze the data.
- Unified intake and eligibility for all the programs.
- **Help in facilitating info sharing among partners.**
- Common assessment tools, common data tools and systems.
- Need assistance with negotiating data exchange agreements.
- Emphasis on removing funding silos.
- Job orders entered into [America's Job Bank](#) should be transferable to JobNet.
- State runs multiple job order systems now – there should be ONE, and they should cross-populate. Same is true for the multiple websites across the state. These should be consolidated.
- State needs to talk to Chambers statewide, possibly get coordination with that system as well.
- No reason why University job system shouldn't interface with state job systems as well. All the systems should interact and interrelate. Jobs for WI Grads could go into JobNet, etc. Shouldn't be so specific to say that no individual system should exist; should just all interact and interrelate. All these things need to come from the STATE.
- Facilitate goal of trying to work with more healthcare-related industries. Mayo clinics have said they're happy to have their orders put onto WI job system, but the Mayo folks aren't going to do this. Just making the software compatible would help.

Overall comment: we need more time to look at these standards! This is a lot of information to process. Also, these notes should go out to other required partners, not just to Boards and Job Center staff.

## **STAFF SKILLS/KNOWLEDGE STANDARD:**

### **Do the standards make sense?**

- Section d: What does “special needs” mean?
- Section e: Change “understand” to something more realistic like, “knowledge of.”
- Define minimum knowledge of program areas staff needs to have.
- Yes, is the ideal standard. But getting to it is hard.

### **Does the guidance make sense?**

- Needs consistent definition of what “staff” means – “Job Center Staff” vs. “individual staffing resource room” – does this mean that *all* program staff need to meet standards?

### **Resources needed from the State?**

- Funding for staff training on the different partner programs.
- **Professional certification and training**
- Set of standard tools across Job Centers. Most have a resume program, but few have the same program.
- Operating funds to use flexibly would be nice. Other than job care funds, Job Centers don’t have this.
- Some sort of training academy to get universal training for staff.
- **Would be nice to allow people out of their silos, to wear different hats (like Job Service does now).**
- More opportunities to hear about best practices within state (similar to the roundtables).
- Peer to peer learning.
- Distance learning is hard – sending staff to Madison isn’t easy for far-flung sites.

## **EVALUATION STANDARD:**

### **Do the standards make sense?**

- No, too general.
- Need gradations of performance standards; not all or nothing measures of success.
- Customer satisfaction – what questions will be asked & what data will be collected?
- Yes, but needs local flexibility.
- People need to know what outcomes will be set by state, how they will be measured, how measurements will be used.

### **Does the guidance make sense?**

- Yes, but it needs to be understood that population can't be driving factor for everything. UI rate should be taken into account, as well as poverty rates and average wage.

### **Resources needed from the state?**

- Definition of customers – employers, job seekers, partner agencies?
- Customer satisfaction surveys that Job Centers do get are LATE, and we don't know who's complaining. Can't address complaint if don't know who complained. Would like these to be real-time to allow Job Centers to address problems.
- Mystery shopper type system – should we do something like that?
  - o DWD: DOL has just contracted to have 150 Job Centers visited across nation with this sort of system. Comment made that Job Center folks would like to know DOL guidelines for this program so they can ensure they're meeting the requirements.
- **Consistent tool statewide for evaluations, so we can compare apples and apples.**
- Customer complaint or request may be beyond capacity of system to respond to. Job Centers may not be able to afford response, especially at a waived center. Would like opportunity to provide customer service in form of contacting customer, giving a sense of what can be provided (even if it's not exactly what customer wants). (Note that many complaints are related to UI, which isn't located at Center. Would be nice if there were a system to address this problem, other than just brochures and phone lines. Offering a person would be much better – even if there only one day per week.)
- Some consistent way to gather traffic information, beyond JobNet reports, to respond to local boards in different centers. No adequate current basis to compare traffic across state or track it over time. (Note: WDA 6 does quarterly hatch mark count – not very scientific, though.) This will range depending on mix of partners, type of center.

## **Segment 2: One-Stop Operators**

### **Do these standards make sense?**

- Need better definition of One-Stop Operator (OSO) – is it a person, group, agency, etc?
- Adds another layer of bureaucracy, more administrative costs
- May encourage WDBs to create another entity to continue; but some WDBs may be happy to get rid of these responsibilities; is there another qualified entity to do it?
- OSO has no authority over partner programs, can't enforce MOU.
- OSO should facilitate writing of business plan, but not do it alone.

- OSO should evaluate performance of what exactly?
- OSO should not provide WIA services if they're in charge of monitoring and evaluation.
- May require major reorganization in some areas.
- Staff attrition means inability to provide oversight as envisioned here.
- **Proposed guidance no. 2: WDB may not be OSO? Does this really mean that WDB cannot be an OSO? Could WDB staff be OSO?**
- What is legal requirement of OSO vs. WDB?
- Who would be responsible for business plan? Seems that comprehensive center would be responsible for BP for satellite and waived centers. Concern about how to retain local ownership if this is the case (e.g., would Job Center in Madison be responsible for BP in Dodge?). Concern this would lead to loss of local elected support for the system in the satellite and waived centers.
- OSO issues under proposed guidance:
  - o No 1: wrong, really is the Board that's responsible. OSO is a contractor to the Board to provide service to set Board's vision into motion. Board has mandated partners; are in best position.
  - o **No. 2 is wrong: WDB should be allowed to be an OSO. Boards have acted as OSO in past to ensure that money goes to centers as they need it. Allows flexibility, whereas contractor OSO would be following a set of state guidelines and be inflexible. Should not be so black and white.**
- What is incentive for mandated partner to work with OSO? Hard enough to get partners to table to work with Board. Also, how will we get partners to take on cost-sharing?
- **Multiple systems out there right now – sometimes a single entity is the OSO, sometimes OSO is a collaboration of providers. Do these guidelines say there can only be one single operator? If so, do we have to dismantle systems already in place and functioning?**
- Concern about people volunteering to go into fiscal agent role – currently, partners do so out of the goodness of their hearts.
- How does WI conflict of interest law affect members of Board, and the roles they plan within the WD system?
- Concern: Job Centers want to know that Boards are engaged in local service delivery, and that they care. This isn't service delivery, but is important function of Board. In some areas, this is accomplished through the Boards taking on financial piece of the OSO function. If state says this isn't OK, it may disrupt what is actually working in some areas.



### Should anything be added to/subtracted from the standards?

- Lots of overlap between what might be a specific WDB role and what might be specific OSO role. Appears to take away local discretion to make those decisions.
- True that under DOL guidance, X number of partners must agree or OSO function goes out on bid?
  - o DWD: 3+ required one-stop partners can petition and become OSO.
- **Get rid of rule that WDB can't be OSO.**

### Resources needed from the State?

- Set of common performance standards for the Job Centers.
- Clear direction from the state to state & non-state agencies (e.g., job service, DVR) on what partner participation means (e.g., contribute common staff, contribute to writing a business plan).
- Money to hire OSO?
- Since this is coming into a current structure, it would be helpful to have a guidance piece to help each area evaluate own structure as it now stands, and evaluate how it could move toward this structure.
- **Would rather see an evaluation of the current system that comes to a set of best practices than impose an entirely new set of requirements on the system.**
- Most partners are members of the WDB; however, some members of Bd may wear different hats at different times (may be protective of one program, not to entire system). State could help by giving guidance to these players on what role they play when.
- Infrastructure support, both dollars and data, is critical.
- Site manager dollars.
- **Some areas have really good coordination among partners, others don't. State needs to take an active role in helping us play better together; needs to broker these relationships.**
- Need a tool to help evaluate perception. Are Boards perceived to be a closed club? Right now there's no way to evaluate this in an honest way. Sense that the deep concern from the state is that the Board is "being the fox, the hen and the egg."

### Segment 3: Job Center Business Plans

#### Make Sense? If not, what's missing?

- Does it have value added for Job Centers?
- Is it supposed to be an administrative plan or a marketing plan?
- Need for marketing plan for businesses, advertise Job Center services.
- P.1: which state regulatory agencies? How do OSOs decide?
- No. 2: clarify "costs."
- Clarify "business services"
- Term "wage" missing on p. 2, present on p. 1. Which correct?
- No. 6: clarify which partners need to provide budget data; also, cannot make budget projections 3 years out. Multiple funding streams, timeframes make unified budgeting and plan writing very difficult.
- WIA audit is not the only audit – what audit do you mean? Other audits will be very hard to get.
- Can business plan focus on 3 or so key areas? Job Service plans do this.
- Overall, make sense. But, difficult to break down cost per service in current funding environment. This is extraordinary challenge.
- No. 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> part: hard to track successes. How do you measure this?
- No. 5: not marketing professionals. Money to market is not there.
- How often will plans need updating?
- Additions:
  - o requirement on how to build additional relationships and bring participants into the Job Centers
  - o How will they become a demand-driven Job Center?
  - o Should be asked for standing contingency plans – what happens when a Job Center has to change partners, change IT, etc.
- Why does SWOT have to be done, and not another analysis?
- Costs associated with services: are we talking overall Job Center service delivery, or just specific services? Latter very difficult.
- What is intent of connection with Dept of Commerce?
- No real requirement to do market research or demand analysis.
- No requirement to look at job seekers other than incumbent workers when thinking about effect of business plan
- No participation requirement from the Department of Commerce – Boards don't have any power over them without top down directives
- Why just Commerce? Why not DOT, Corrections, etc?
- **Does not seem to take account of what's already been done in areas – economic plans, etc. This looks like someone started with blank piece of paper, and said "do this." Disconnect from where we already are to this plan. Need to start with small steps, start with who is actually walking in the door right now.**
- Some of the requirements seem strategic in nature and region-wide, not Job Center specific – seem to fit into Area plan more than business plan. Perhaps

some things should be addressed at regional level, implemented locally. Maybe business plan as a whole should be regional.

- **Seems that what we really want is an outcome-based plan. Instead of micromanaged script, we should look at outcomes we expect each board to achieve (start with performance measures). We should not think about centers, we should think about outcomes. We can't afford to start at the center level now. Need to figure out how we'll deliver services we need to deliver.**
- Business plans are actually helpful because they show partners their place in the system, encourage them to take an active role (and pay!). Another use for these: can potentially allow Job Centers to raise foundation funding for operations and creative projects.

### **What would be hard to implement?**

- Lots of this will be hard to implement without participation requirements or definition of participation built into system. Multi-partner business plans without participation requirements will not work.
- Need to look at business planning process on regional process, not center by center. Centers may have smaller plans to implement regional goals, but shouldn't have own plan.
- Without cost-sharing requirements, will be impossible to implement this part.
- Most One-Stops are not incorporated and aren't required to have audit; will be hard to get financial info from them as a result.

### **Resources needed from the state?**

- **State needs to drive Commerce and other state agency involvement.**
- State needs to engage DPI to provide more alternative ed at secondary level.
- Partners will have to be required to be engaged in process, including putting \$ on table.
- Need definitions, starting with OSOs.
- **Need support from state so boards don't have to stop serving people walking in the door in order to do this planning process.**
- **Money and teeth.**
- Need commitments from system – how to plan for a program if it will be potentially cut next year? Stakeholders need reassurance.
- State needs to recognize work that boards have already done, especially where they've already done business plans.

### Segment 3: Job Center Service Delivery System:

#### YOUTH (especially out-of-school youth)

- Really need to address 18-21 year olds as “Adults” – market to this group better, improve outreach. This age group has access to same Adult services we are already providing
- Not enough AODA and mental health services funds for this group.
- Apprenticeships/hands on experience in local industry often work well for this group.
- Statewide PSA on importance of HS diploma, GED. Employers won’t hire without this.
- Take down Job Center sign that says “No kids allowed.”
- Outreach to schools – but question of who will do outreach given that so few kids are actually WIA youth eligible.
- Designated youth center in Job Center, possibly a virtual youth Job Center. Kids are very savvy on the computer; maybe we could focus system on career awareness of future jobs as well as current available jobs.
- Some centers have very active youth provider partners, others do not. If they could be located in the center, this would help. If not, at least have a youth corner.
- Connect with alternative high schools.
- Continue to create exposure programs for youth (workshops etc) and bring those into the center.
- Youth contractors should be at least itinerantly located in centers
- Job Corps as more active partner.
- In the Northwest CEP, the Job Centers use profiling system as soft skills tool – they go out to alternative high schools and show school counselors how to look at profile, hook kids up to Job Centers.
- Money for DPI for career centers.
- Statewide curriculum with different tracks, to help individuals get credentialed for various occupations. Make this short term, easy to achieve.
- Looking at targeted occupational clusters, there needs to be more focus on career ladder stuff. Maybe using apprenticeship system as a model for out of school youth, to start moving them toward high-wage, high skill occupations.
- In rural areas, out of school youth are difficult to find and serve. Also very difficult to follow up with.
- When does a “youth” become an “adult”? Youth are maturing at older age now; need to think about different categories of youth, and different outreach strategies for different ages.
  - o DWD: points out that some experts are saying that young people don’t really mature until their early 30s. One version of WIA reauthorization would push the age limit of youth to 24.
- Job Centers will have to be innovative in order to attract youth population. Right now youth don’t feel welcome.

- Partnerships with K-12 and tech colleges to cooperate and leverage their money and resources.
- Difficult to connect youth to actual employment. Mechanisms to do this are not adequate.
- We don't put enough time and energy into the youth problem. Gets short shrift.
- Need to focus on graduating youth, especially young men – fewer young men are going on to higher ed. DPI should put emphasis on engaging local school districts with the Job Center system, so that these youth connect with the workforce development system at graduation. This could be combined with DPI making resources available for Job Centers.
- Most youth try several jobs before they're successful. Performance standards for older youth are almost impossible to meet. Those already working have a lot of difficulty making earnings gain, and they probably will switch jobs before too long. Perhaps performance standards for older youth should be reevaluated.

### **COMMUNITY/FAITH-BASED**

- Improve outreach to these groups – information sharing.
- Access volunteer opportunities for clients at these organizations.
- Need for TA and criteria on establishing relationships, and on what these should look like.
- Concerns about liability.
- Local staff need to develop awareness of programs and services offered.
- Wausau practice of having all service providers get together on the last Friday of the month to share information is a good idea.
- Outreach strategy to these groups should be part of business plan.
- Potentially physically bring in some organizations to the Job Center.
- Use more of these groups as subcontracts. (But, contracting with FBOs in the W-2 world does have problems – some customers may be opposed to working with these organizations. Gets back to need for state guidance on how to handle these relationships.)
- Job Centers could set minimum standards for service provision and then give customers a choice among multiple providers.
- Updated information on services provided at Job Centers, which could be given to regional organizations.
- Avoid endorsement of one faith; spread out contracts to all groups.
- Improve Job Center menu of services to include services provided by region's CFBOs.
- Having regular meetings with related organizations is very important.
- Take advantage of volunteer networks of CFBOs.
- Look for/develop FBO resource inventories for region (Fox Valley does this).
- Look to United Way, which could play role in facilitating these relationships.
- Department of Corrections has probably had experience working with FBOs; see what they have done, what has worked and not worked.
- Working with FBOs in particular, might be some way to incorporate non-discrimination hiring process requirements from state into contracts with them.
- Some concern about proselytizing in delivery of services.

## DEMAND-DRIVEN

- Recognize that employer demands can be unreasonable.
- Employers want 'job matching' services. Consider charging fee for this, other types of services.
- Re-educate employer community on what Job Centers have to offer.
- **Further define “demand-driven,” “high-wage,” “high-growth,” etc. If intent is to focus training dollars here, it’s important we figure out what it means.**
- **Staff LMI positions! There is a huge amount of data, and Job Centers need to know how to understand it and use it.**
- Question of whether we’re truly addressing customer need and choice if we’re only focusing on certain target industries.
- Watch out for WDA-level data; sometimes data varies greatly across area.
- ED agencies, tech colleges, and business and industry centers need to be fully connected in to Job Centers and the WD system.
- In NW, there is now a multi-partner team that does out and makes calls to businesses, tells them what services the Job Centers can provide. Model might be helpful in other places.
- **Training field staff so they understand what high-growth, etc. actually means. Use tools already in the Job Centers to identify these jobs.**
- JWF model – working with board, tech colleges, other providers, businesses to provide feedback to the WD system, making system more responsive to business.
- In Western Wisconsin, Job Centers do LMI workshops that are fairly short – might be good model for the rest of the state.
- Partnering with ED across different partners
- **More emphasis on demand-driven analysis. Better LMI, more market research capacity. Can’t have demand-driven system without knowing what demand is – includes future projected jobs, future projected skills.**
- On consumer side, need better assessment tools for job seekers.
- **Currently we have problem in system overall, that high-demand occupations run up against bottlenecks in training. If state is going to take on issue of being responsive to demand, then they have to put resources into training programs to break down bottlenecks. Will include putting resources into industry partnerships.**
- Potential definition for demand-driven: “Gap caused by forward movement.”
- Need to be able to devote adequate staff time to connect with these high-growth businesses.
- System has to recognize that we have made change in customer over last few years. Traditionally Job Centers have been driven by jobseeker. Now, primary customer is employer. This is significant change.
- Regular training for business services teams within Job Centers.

- Concern that this focus means that Job Centers won't be serving people with barriers, who won't be able to get into these jobs.
  - o DWD: focus on these jobs is based on fact that per capita income is lower in the state than in surrounding states. This is not to say that everyone in state is ready or able to go into these jobs; we still need to help people to gradually move into family-supporting jobs.
- But others note: we never talk about fact that some of these businesses just don't pay enough. We seem to have a sense that it's not OK to talk about this. Possibly because we haven't been able to make a distinction between good and bad employers.
  - o COWS: some of this info is out there, e.g. turnover rate of every nursing home in the county. We just don't systematically use these data.
- Needs to be focus on educating employers on bigger issues: changes in workforce, developing career ladders, etc. On job seeker side, needs to be more transparency about career ladders, and how one job may lead to another.
- On supply side, many Job Centers aren't serving higher skill people that well because of lack of access to the higher skill employers.
  - o DWD: notes that pending worker shortage could end up providing a great opportunity for Job Centers to facilitate these connections. Also points out there is nothing wrong with DWD targeting its employer services. Collecting data on employer turnover, wages, etc. could be a means to this, as could teaching job seekers themselves to assess the quality of employers. Need to be working on this issue from both directions, from job seeker direction and from employer direction.
- One strategy Job Centers are trying is to find the higher-growth, high-wage jobs, but also provide some backfill for people coming in every day. But there is a disconnect with training – need to provide transferable skills but also on-demand skills for the high-wage workers.

## Acronyms

<b>CBO</b>	Community-Based Organization
<b>DOL</b>	U.S. Department of Labor
<b>ED</b>	Economic Development
<b>FBO</b>	Faith-Based Organization
<b>FCBO</b>	Faith- and Community-Based Organization
<b>GED</b>	General Equivalency Diploma
<b>JC</b>	Job Center
<b>TA</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>TC</b>	Technical College
<b>WD</b>	Workforce Development